

REMARKS

The application includes claims 1-29 prior to entering this amendment.

The examiner objects to claims 4 and 5 for informalities. The examiner indicates allowable claim 12 if rewritten in independent form to include all of the limitations of the corresponding base and any intervening claims. The examiner rejects claims 1-11, 13-15 and 22-28 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable by Hase, et al. (U.S. Patent 5,636,254).

The applicants amend claims 1, 4-6, 12-14, 22-23 and 25.

The application remains with claims 1-29 after entering this amendment.

The applicants add no new matter and request reconsideration.

Claim Objections

The applicants amend claims 4-5 and 13 to obviate the examiner's objections.

Allowable Subject Matter

The applicants thank examiner Tran for allowing claims 16-21 and 29 and indicating claim 12 allowable if rewritten in independent form.

The applicants rewrite claim 12 in independent form to include all the limitations of base claim 6 and intervening claim 9. Claim 12 should be in condition for the examiner's allowance.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §103

The examiner rejects claims 1-11, 13-15 and 22-28 as obvious over Hase. The applicants disagree for the reasons that follow.

Claim 1 recites *a second signal transmission path for receiving a second input signal distinct from the first input signal...and an auxiliary signal transmission path for receiving the first input signal....* That is, and as shown in the applicants' Figure 5, the first and auxiliary signal transmission lines receive the same first input signal, e.g., IS1, and the second signal transmission line receives a second input signal, e.g., IS2, distinct from the first input signal.

The examiner suggests Hase's "read data path... corresponds to the claimed second signal transmission path and is delayed by a second delay line from the data path." Office Action, page 4. But Hase's path from read data signal 6 through delay line 2 that outputs delay signal A (reference numeral 9) and delay signal B (reference numeral 10) does not

receive two distinct input signals, e.g., IS1 and IS2, as required by the claims. In all Hase embodiments, including that shown in Figure 2, a common signal READ DATA is input at 6 to the window adjustment circuit 1. Even if Hase's reference signal 7 is considered to disclose the second input signal and the path from 7 through delay PLL 3 to disclose the second signal transmission path, an argument the examiner does not make, Hase would fail to disclose the recited auxiliary transmission path.

Claim 1 recites *a first signal transmission path ... for outputting a corresponding first output signal which is delayed by a first delay time from the first input signal and a second signal transmission path ... for outputting a corresponding second temporary signal which is delayed by a second delay time from the second input signal*. The examiner alleges Hase discloses the recited first transmission path with its reference signal path and the recited second transmission signal path with its read data path. It would follow, then, that the examiner suggests the reference signal path outputs the first output signal delayed by a first delay time from the first input signal and that the read data path outputs the second temporary signal delayed by a second delay time from the second input signal. But the reference signal path outputs a single signal, the control signal 12, that the examiner alleges discloses the recited adjustment control signal. And since Hase does not disclose the recited second input signal, as we explain above, it cannot therefore output the second temporary signal delayed by the second delay time from the second input signal as recited.

Claim 1 recites *a master delay unit for generating a master output signal having a master delay*. The examiner appears to make no argument regarding Hase's disclosure of the recited master delay unit. The applicants request some guidance.

Claim 1 recites *a control unit for generating an adjustment control signal responsive to the first output signal and the master output signal*. The examiner alleges Hase discloses the recited control unit with its phase comparator 51, charge pump 52, and V/I 54 in Figure 8 and the recited adjustment control signal with its control signal 12. But none of Hase's phase comparator 51, charge pump 52, and V/I 54 in Figure 8 operate responsive to both *the first output signal* (reference signal 7) *AND the master output signal* as required by the claims.

In addition, claim 14 recites *the controlling unit is adapted to generate the adjustment control signal according to a phase difference between the first output signal and the first temporary signal* where the first temporary signal is output from *an auxiliary signal transmission path ... and having a third delay associated with the second delay time*. The recited second delay time is associated with the second input signal distinct from the first

input signal. As we note above, Hase does not disclose the second input signal recited and thus, cannot disclose the first temporary signal recited in claim 14.

Claim 14 further recites *the adjustment control signal has a voltage level proportional to the phase difference according to a first proportionality constant* where the phase difference is between the first output signal and the first temporary signal. Since Hase does not disclose the recited first temporary signal, it cannot disclose the phase difference that defines the voltage level of the adjustment control signal.

Claim 1 is in condition for the examiner's allowance.

Claims 6, 14, 23 and 24-28 recite limitations similar to those highlighted above with regard to claim 1. As such, claims 6, 14, 23 and 24-28, and their dependent claims, are likewise in condition for the examiner's allowance.

Conclusion

The applicants request reconsideration and allowance of all pending claims. The applicants encourage the Examiner to telephone the undersigned at (503) 222-3613 if it appears that an interview would be helpful in advancing the case.

Customer No. 20575

Respectfully submitted,

MARGER JOHNSON & McCOLLOM, P.C.



Graciela G. Cowger
Registration No. 42,444

MARGER JOHNSON & McCOLLOM, P.C.
210 SW Morrison Street, Suite 400
Portland, OR 97204
(503) 222-3613

I hereby certify that this correspondence
is being transmitted to the U.S. Patent and
Trademark Office via facsimile number
(571) 273-8300 on January 18, 2006.


Li Mei Vermilya